Docket No. 30012797-1 (1509-216) PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of	
Inventors; John ERICKSON et al.	: Confirmation No.: 6750
Inventors, som Erdertson et al.	:
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/941,606	: Group Art Unit: 2162
	:
Filed: August 30, 2001	: Examiner: Anh LY
	:
For: SOFTWARE MEDIA CONTAINER	

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

•

Attn: BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

SECOND AMENDED BRIEF ON APPEAL

Further to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated July 18, 2007, the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated May 4, 2007, the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed June 7, 2006, the Appeal Brief filed December 23, 2005 and the Notice of Appeal filed October 28, 2005, in connection with the above-identified application on appeal, herewith is Appellant's Second Amended Brief on Appeal. The \$500 statutory fee was paid on December 23, 2005. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025 for any other required fees not otherwise provided for.

Serial No. 09/941.606

To the extent necessary, Appellant hereby requests any required extension of time under

37 C.F.R. §1.136 and hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any required fees not

otherwise provided for to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

With respect to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed June 7, 2006,

Appellants asserted that the Appeal Brief was compliant as claims 2 and 8 were not argued

separately and therefore under 37 C.F.R. 41.37(c)(1)(v) there was no need for separate

submission of these claims under the Summary of Claimed Subject Matter heading. In order to

further processing of the Appeal Brief to a decision by the Board, Appellants included

additional material regarding claims 2 and 8 in the Amended Appeal Brief filed June 1, 2007.

Because the July 18, 2007 Non-Compliant Appeal Brief notice does not mention an outstanding

issue with respect to claims 2 and 8, Appellants believe that the previous issue has been

overcome with respect to claims 2 and 8.

With respect to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed July 18, 2007,

Appellants believe that the limitations of claim 1 have been sufficiently and clearly cited with

respect to the specification. Further, Appellants believe that the limitations of claims 5 and 11

have been sufficiently and clearly cited with respect to the specification. Further still,

Appellants point out that claim 9 has not been separately argued in the appeal and, as such, no

summary of claim 9 is necessary in the present Amended Brief on Appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

John ERICKSON et al.

Randy A. Noranbrock

Registration No. 42,940 Telephone: (703) 684-1111

Date: August 9, 2007

2